

**REMARKS**

Applicants has cancelled claims 49-51, amended claims 1, 12, and 20, and added new claim 52 which is believed to be distinguishable over the cited references and in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding office action is respectfully requested.

The Office has rejected claims 49-51 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Accordingly, Applicant has cancelled claims 49-51. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

The Office has rejected claims 1, 12, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, asserting they contain subject matter “a template edit merging device that merges a modified item template back into the electronic document even if the user edits the content of one or more items managed by the item template in the actively live web page, **while the same item template for which the user edits the content is simultaneously being modified or updated by an author of the electronic document**” (emphasis added), which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office’s interpretation. First, Applicant notes that the Office is failing to take into account the entire description in paragraph [0054] in the published version of the above-identified patent application. By way of example only, the Office’s attention is respectfully requested to the underlined and in particular bold portions of paragraph [0054] of the published application where it is disclosed (emphasis added):

[0054] In an exemplary embodiment, the selective editing system 100 uses a CGI script to implement the above methods. This CGI script uses the same file locking and waiting strategy for both kinds of editing. Thus, it is possible for the page author to **modify an item template at the same time that the contributor is adding or editing items to a page.** Thus, web pages that use the template editing technique described in accordance with the exemplary systems and methods of this invention can remain "live" to

**contributors, even while item templates or the overall HTML is being modified or updated.**

Additionally, Applicant respectfully directs the Office's attention to page 3, lines 20-28, which state, "The exemplary systems and methods of this invention provide tools for group editing of electronic documents. In particular, the tools allow for group editing of web pages. By parsing a web page and locating elements, such as items, templates, and formatting code, such as HTML, within a web page, a user is presented with a user interface that allows for editing of those elements. Furthermore, by performing a check, upon completion of editing of one or more elements within a web page, the updated web page is merged with the "live" version of the web page to incorporate any changes that may have also been made by other users. In this manner, the web page remains live, and changes made to the live group-editable page are not lost" (Emphasis added).

An exemplary advantage of the Applicant's claimed invention is that a page author who wishes to modify the layout of a group-editable web page with the formatting of its contributions does not need to take the web page off-line, read the entire page into a text editor or HTML authoring tool and then use the editor or tool to change the overall page, the template, the data items, or some combination of these items. Instead, by performing edits to item templates while the content of the items themselves are being edited by the user(s), web pages can be updated considerably faster than conventional web page editing techniques. In view of the foregoing remarks, the Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

The Office has rejected claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-16, 18-21, 23-34, 37-38, 41-42 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) being unpatentable over Bay-Wei Chang, "In-Place Editing of Web Pages: Sparrow Community-Shared Documents", published 04/1998 (Chang), in view of US Patent No. 6,745,238 to Giljum (Giljum), and further in view of US Patent No. 6,654,032 to Zhu (Zhu), claims 49-51 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang, Giljum and Zhu and further in view of Crespo and Bier, "WebWriter: A Browser-Based Editor for Constructing Web Applications" (Applicant's IDS), published in 1996 (Crespo-Bier).

Chang, Giljum and Zhu, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest, "a template edit merging device that merges a modified item template back into the electronic document even if the user edits the content of one or more items managed by the

item template in the actively live web page, while the same item template for which the user edits the content is simultaneously being modified or updated by an author of the electronic document,” as recited in claim 1, or “merging a modified item template back into the electronic document even if the user edits the content of one or more items managed by the item template in an actively live web page, while the same item template for which the user edits the content is simultaneously being modified or updated by an author of the electronic document,” as recited in claims 12 and 20.

The Office has asserted, “Thus, the Chang reference provides a sufficient suggestion to those skilled in the art to modify the Chang system to permit merging of modified first information back into the electronic document even if second information was altered while the first information was modified, so long as the first and second information are not the same information.” However, the specific language of Chang contradicts the Office’s position. In particular, Chang discloses “one user may change an item on a page without affecting users who are editing **other items on the same page**,” (See, cited portions of Chang at pp. 14, section 4.6). Similarly, on page 7, lines 16-19, cited by the Office, Chang discloses, “the user is only asked to intervene on rare occasions when an item has been simultaneously edited.” (emphasis added). Further, Chang discloses, “[b]ecause editing with Sparrow occurs at such a fine grain (per item) and the time to edit each item is typically short (because items are small), such conflicts are rare.” (Emphasis added). Thus, at most Chang discloses or suggests editing of different items only, simultaneously or otherwise, and does not disclose merging item templates and content associated with the same item template, both being modified simultaneously by an author of the electronic document and a user, respectively, into the electronic document, as claimed. Like Chang, the other cited references do not disclose or suggest Applicant’s editing content of one or more items and item templates simultaneously, and thus fail to resolve this deficiency in Chang.

In contrast, Applicant’s claimed invention allows a user to edit the content associated with an item template at the same time when an author of the electronic document is editing the same item template itself. By way of example only, the Office’s attention is again respectfully requested to paragraph [0054] of the published application where it is disclosed (emphasis added):

[0054] In an exemplary embodiment, the selective editing system 100 uses a CGI script to implement the above methods. This CGI script uses the same file locking and waiting strategy for both kinds of editing. Thus, it is possible for the page author to **modify an item template at the same time** that the contributor is **adding or editing items to a page**. Thus, web pages that use the template editing technique described in accordance with the exemplary systems and methods of this invention can remain "live" to contributors, **even while item templates or the overall HTML is being modified or updated**.

An exemplary advantage of the Applicant's claimed invention is that a page author who wishes to modify the layout of a group-editable web page with the formatting of its contributions does not need to take the web page off-line, read the entire page into a text editor or HTML authoring tool and then use the editor or tool to change the overall page, the template, the data items, or some combination of these items. Instead, by performing edits to item templates while the content of the items themselves are being edited by the user(s), web pages can be updated considerably faster than conventional web page editing techniques.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection of claims 1, 12, and 20. Since claims 2, 3, 5-11, 28, 29, 34, 37, and 49 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 1, claims 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 30, 31, 38, 41, and 50 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 12, and claims 21, 23-27, 32, 33, 42, 45, and 51 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 20, they are distinguishable over the cited references and patentable in the same manner as claims 1, 12, and 20.

In view of all of the foregoing, Applicant submits that this case is in condition for allowance and such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 7, 2010

/Gunnar G. Leinberg/

Gunnar G. Leinberg  
Registration No. 35,584

**NIXON PEABODY LLP**  
1100 Clinton Square  
Rochester, New York 14604  
Telephone: (585) 263-1014  
Facsimile: (585) 263-1600